

**HIGH PRESSURE CO₂ SEPARATION USING MEMBRANES:
MEMBRANE SELECTION AND PROCESS MODELING**

by

JIMOH KAYODE ADEWOLE

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

May 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All Praise and Thanks are due to Allah (SWT) who alone has made this research work a success. “Glory to You, we have no knowledge except what you have taught us. Verily, it is You, the All-Knower, All-Wise. (Q2:32)”

With deep sense of gratitude and appreciation, I would like to say thank you to my thesis supervisor, Professor Abdul Latif Ahmad for his inspiring guidance and excellent support during this research work. He has been of immense assistance right from the time I signified my intension to begin my PhD. I also thank my co-supervisors - Dr Leo Choe Peng and Dr Suzylawati Binti Ismail for their academic elucidation and skillful review of my thesis write up. I am grateful to Dr Abdullah S. Sultan, Director, Center for Petroleum & Minerals, King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, Saudi Arabia for his supports and encouragements.

I am indebted to my father, Alhaji T. Adewole, for his prayers, patient and blessings. Tribute to my late mother, Mrs F. A. Adewole. May Allah forgive her, overlook her shortcomings and grant her Al-Janah firdaus (ameen). I appreciate the untiring supports of my wife and children for their patience and understanding during the seemingly unending hours spent both in the laboratory and in preparing this Thesis. Special thanks to all my brothers and sisters: Alhaji Abdul Rauf Abdul Salam Adewole, Halimat Sadiat Binti Adewole, Sergeant Lukman Adewole, and Abdul Wasiu (Oluomo) Adewole.

I will like to acknowledge the financial support received under the LRGS 304/PJKIMIA/6050296/U124 and ERGS 203/PJKIMIA/6730110. The supports of the

Membrane Science and Technology Cluster Research Group, Universiti Sains Malaysia is also acknowledged.

My special thanks to all the technicians in the Membrane Technology, Analytical and Petroleum Labs, my colleagues in Membrane Separation research and to the staff of IPS Engineering campus for their professional way of attending to my problems as a graduate student.

Sincerely,

Jimoh K. ADEWOLE

May, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xix
ABSTRAK	xxiii
ABSTRACT	xxv
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 World Population and Energy Scenario	1
1.2 Natural Gas	2
1.3 Natural Gas Processing using Membrane Separation Technology	3
1.4 Research Overview of Polymeric Membranes for High Pressure CO ₂ Separation	6
1.5 Problem Statement	8
1.6 Research Objective	12
1.7 Scope of the Study	13
1.8 Organization of the Dissertation	14

CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW	16
2.1 Polymeric Membrane for Gas Separation	16
2.2 Membrane Materials and their Structures	21
2.3 Dual – Layer Membrane Configurations	24
2.4 Fundamental of Gas Separation in Polymer Membranes	25
2.5 Achieving Better Balance of Gas Selectivity and Permeability	30
2.6 Penetrant – Induced Plasticization	33
2.7 Effect of Penetrant – Induced Plasticization Phenomenon	40
2.8 Membrane Thickness and Separation Performance	43
2.9 Effect of Casting Solvent on Membrane performance	45
2.10 Techniques for Improving Separation Performance of Polymeric Membranes	47
2.10.1 Cross-linking and Thermal Treatment Techniques	48
2.10.2 Template Polymerization and Use of Porogens	57
2.10.3 Dual-layer Membrane Preparation and Hollow Fiber Spinning	61
2.11 Overview of Membrane Module Configuration	65
2.12 Modeling and Optimization of Membrane Separation Processes for Gas Separation involving Plasticizing Feed Streams	67
2.12.1 Models for Permeability – Pressure Relationship	67
2.12.2 Prediction of Plasticization Pressure using Support Vector Machine	70
2.12.3 Performance Measure of SVM	72
2.12.4 Methods of Optimization	73

2.12.5	Mathematics of Optimization	75
2.12.6	Optimization Algorithm and Software	76
2.12.7	Procedure for Solving Optimization Problems	77
2.13	Overview of Optimization Studies on Membrane Gas Separation	78
2.14	Costs and Membrane Process Optimization	80
2.15	Summary	81
 CHAPTER THREE – MATERIALS AND METHODS		 83
3.1	Materials and Chemicals	86
3.2	Experimental Method	86
3.2.1	Solvent Selection and Estimation of Solubility Parameters	86
3.2.2	Preparation of Membranes	90
3.2.3	Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)	91
3.2.4	Gas Permeation Measurement	92
3.2.5	Gas Sorption Test	93
3.2.6	Estimation of Plasticization Pressure	94
3.2.7	Dynamic Evaluation of the Plasticization Phenomenon	94
3.2.8	Thermo Gravimetric Analysis and Quantification of Residual Solvent	94
3.2.9	X-ray diffraction (XRD)	95
3.3	Membrane Process Modeling and Optimization Studies	96
3.3.1	Plasticization Pressure and Permeability Data Collection	96
3.3.2	Derivation of New Membrane Selection Criterion in terms of	

Productivity Loss	114
3.3.3 Model - Based Approach for Membrane Materials Selection for High Pressure Membrane Gas Separation Operations involving Plasticizing Feed Streams	105
3.3.3.1 Multi Objective Optimization of Membrane Material Selection	105
3.3.3.2 Scaling of Membrane Properties	106
3.3.3.3 Performance Index	108
3.3.3.4 Determination of the Scaling Factor	109
3.4 Process Modeling and Analysis of Membrane Gas Separation Module	111
CHAPTER FOUR – RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: EXPERIMENTAL	117
4.1 Solubility and Flory – Huggins Parameters	117
4.2 Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)	118
4.3 Gas Permeation Measurement	124
4.4 Comparative Analysis of the Physico-chemical Properties of Membranes Prepared from DEG and other Solvents	131
4.4.1 Gas Permeability	131
4.4.2 Average Interchain Distances using X-ray diffraction (XRD)	135
4.4.3 Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR)	136
4.4.4 Thermo gravimetric analysis (TGA)	138
4.5 Time Dependent Permeability of the Membrane	139
4.6 Sorption Test	147

CHAPTER FIVE – RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: MODELING	150
5.1 Model Parameters	150
5.1.1 Plasticization Pressure and Permeability Parameters at Plasticization	152
5.1.2 Productivity Loss at Plasticization Pressure	153
5.1.3 Modified Upper Bound Relationship for Plasticization Resistant Membrane Materials	157
5.2 Model Based Selection of Membrane Materials for High Pressure Separation	159
5.3 Structure Property Relationship and Prediction of Plasticization Pressure	161
5.3.1 Prediction of Plasticization Pressure using Exponential Regression	169
5.3.2 Prediction of Plasticization Pressure using Support Vector Machine Regression Algorithm	172
5.4 Models for Permeability – Pressure Relationship	174
5.5 Performance Analysis of the Membranes Modules	175
5.5.1 Effect of Feed Pressure on product recovery and purity	175
5.5.2 Effect of Feed Pressure on Membrane Area Requirement	178
5.5.3 Effect of Feed Pressure on Methane Loss	178
5.5.4 Effect of Feed Pressure on Gas Processing Cost	180
5.6 Membrane Process Optimization	185

5.6.1	Optimization Model	185
5.6.2	Single Stage Configuration	186
 CHAPTER SIX		
	CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE STUDIES	188
6.1	Conclusion	188
6.2	Recommendations and Future Studies	190
	REFERENCES	192
	APPENDICES	240
	APPENDIX A	240
	APPENDIX B	241
	APPENDIX C	246
	APPENDIX D	249
	APPENDIX E	261
	APPENDIX F	263
	APPENDIX G	264
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	265

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Typical natural gas compositions for Bargading Platform in Malaysia (Wan Abu Bakar and Ali 2010)	3
Table 1.2	Natural gas specifications for commercial applications (Datta and Sen 2006; Safari et al. 2009; Kidnay et al. 2011; Ahmad et al. 2012)	4
Table 1.3	Future Natural Gas requirement of Asia (BCM) (Ghosh and Associates 2008)	5
Table 1.4	Commercial Membranes used for Natural Gas Separation (Baker 2002; Baker 2004; Baker and Lokhandwala 2008; Bernardo et al. 2009; Murphy et al. 2009a; Horn and Paul 2011b)	7
Table 2. 1	Separation performance of CO ₂ /CH ₄ with rubbery and glassy polymers (Murphy et al., 2009)	19
Table 2. 2	Membrane with high permeability and selectivity	20
Table 2.3	Industrial membrane gas separation plants (Engelien, 2004, Koros et al., 2009b)	23
Table 2. 4	Plasticization pressure and Performance efficiency of Matrimid 5218 (Horn and Paul, 2011a, Bos et al., 1998a, Tin et al., 2003)	42
Table 2. 5	Plasticization pressure and Performance efficiency of 6FDA-2,6-DAT (Safari et al., 2009)	43
Table 2. 6	Glassy Polymeric Membrane Classification into Different Regime of Thickness	44
Table 2. 7	Plasticization pressure and permeability of polysulfone prepared from spin coating at 35 °C (Scholes et al., 2010a)	44
Table 2. 8	Mixed and multicomponent gas mixture permeability and selectivity of cross-linked copolyimides membrane (Wind et al., 2004)	53
Table 2. 9	Improved plasticization resistance of polyimide using thermal and chemical cross-linking (Staudt-Bickel and Koros, 1999; Kratochvil and Koros, 2008)	55
Table 2. 10	Mixed gas (CO ₂ /CH ₄ :50/50) permeability, ideal selectivity and separation factor of cross-linked 6FDA-ODA and TemMPD membranes (Chen et al., 2012)	60
Table 2. 11	Plasticization properties of cross-linked 6FDA-ODA and 6FDA-ODA (50%)-TemMPD (50%) membranes (Chen et al., 2012)	61

Table 2. 12	Various Membrane Improvement Techniques and Plasticization Pressures	68
Table 3. 1	Physical Properties and the Costs of Various Solvents	89
Table 3. 2	Molar attraction constants and the overall solubility parameters for polymer and the solvent	91
Table 3. 3	Dual sorption model data for various kinds of polysulfone (PSF), polyethersulfones (PES), phenylene oxide (PPO), polycarbonate and polyimides (McHattie et al. 1991b; Kamps et al. 1992; McHattie et al. 1992; Houde et al. 1994; Kumazawa et al. 1994; Srinivasan et al. 1994; Wang et al. 2002b)	103
Table 3. 4	Performance data of Membranes of various glassy polymers	107
Table 3. 5	Relative importance of performance goals using modified digital logic method	110
Table 3. 6	Base – Case Process Operating Conditions	112
Table 3. 7	Economic parameters (Bhide and Stern 1993a; Baker 2004; Peters et al., 2011)	115
Table 3. 8	Parameters for cost of membrane element	116
Table 4. 1	Solubility and Flory – Huggins parameters of various solvents	118
Table 4. 2	Pure CO ₂ and CH ₄ permeability of dense top layer membrane sample with supports thermally treated at 110 °C under vacuum for 36 hour	125
Table 4. 3	Plasticization pressure, permeability, solubility and diffusion coefficient at plasticization pressure of various PSF membranes	130
Table 4. 4	Estimated plasticization pressure	130
Table 4. 5	Pure CO ₂ and CH ₄ permeability of dense PSF membrane sample 35 °C	132
Table 4. 6	Calculated d – spacings for PSF membranes made from various solvents	136
Table 4. 7	Infrared Spectra of PSF-DEG Membranes	138
Table 4. 8	Percentage change in permeability at 35 hrs	146
Table 4. 9	Dual-mode sorption parameters for dense top layer compared with values from literature	149

Table 5. 1	Ranges of Values obtained for the Coefficients of the quadratic equation	151
Table 5. 2	Significance of a_1 and a_2 on the plasticization pressure and permeability of some membranes (details are provided in Appendix B)	153
Table 5. 3	Selected membrane materials for illustrative case study	161
Table 5. 4	Correlation Parameters found for the relationship between the model parameters and polymer properties	170
Table 5. 5	Optimum parameters for the trained models	172
Table 5. 6	Best results for the trained models	172
Table 5. 7	Effect of membrane life time on the annual gas processing cost	185
Table 5. 8	Optimum values of process variables for processing 3.5 MMCFD of 50 mol% CO ₂ natural gas	187

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2. 1	Membrane Classification (Koros et al. 2009a; Ahmad et al. 2013)	17
Figure 2. 2	Industrial membrane CO ₂ separation plant and its process conditions (Membrane material research Inc, USA)	23
Figure 2. 3	Permeability and permselectivity for pure gases at feed pressure of 3.5 atm and 30 °C	30
Figure 2.4	Robeson's 1991 and 2008 upper bound curves representing a general trade-off for membrane gas separation performance for CO ₂ /CH ₄ [(a) Park and Lee, 2008; (b) Xiao et al., (2009)]	31
Figure 2.5	Permeability of CO ₂ as a function of feed pressure in glassy PSF and rubbery PEO (Data used for this plot were obtained from Scholes et al., 2010a; and Lin and Freeman, 2004)	36
Figure 2. 6	Separation performance of decarboxylation-induced thermal cross - linking of hollow fiber 6FDA-DAM:DABA (3:2) membrane for pure CO ₂ gas (Qiu et al., 2011)	54
Figure 3. 1	Flow chart of the experimental work	84
Figure 3. 2	Flow chart of the modeling and optimization	85
Figure 3. 3	Chemical Structures of polymer, solvents and additive	87
Figure 3. 4	Plasticization resistance properties of two 6FDA based polyimide membranes replotted from ref (Chen et al. 2012)	98
Figure 3. 5	Schematic of gas transport in non-porous membrane	112
Figure 3. 6	Process Flow Diagram of Membrane System	112
Figure 4. 1	Cross-section image to check the roughness of the top of PSF-Support immersed in water after 30 seconds of Free Standing Time	119
Figure 4. 2	Cross-section image to check the roughness of the top of PSF-Support immersed in water after 1 minute of Free Standing Time	119
Figure 4. 3	Cross-section image to check the roughness of the top of PSF-Support immersed in water after 20 minutes of Free Standing Time	120
Figure 4. 4	Cross-section image to check the roughness of the top of PSF-Support immersed in water after 120 minutes of Free Standing Time	120

Figure 4. 5	SEM Micrograph of the pore of the support with 20 minutes Free Standing Time	121
Figure 4. 6	SEM Micrograph of the cross section of the top layer of PSF-DEG Membrane	123
Figure 4. 7	SEM micrograph of the surface of the top layer at various magnifications	123
Figure 4. 8	SEM micrograph of composite membrane (the top layer and the porous support)	124
Figure 4. 9	Permeability of dense top layer as a function of upstream pressure	126
Figure 4. 10	Permeability of the porous support as a function of upstream pressure	127
Figure 4. 11	TGA of dense top layer of the membrane	129
Figure 4. 12	Relationship between the gas permeability and molar volume of the casting solvents	134
Figure 4. 13	X – Ray Diffraction Patterns of membranes	135
Figure 4. 14	FTIR Spectra of PSF membranes with different solvents	137
Figure 4. 15	TGA Spectra of membranes made from various solvents	139
Figure 4. 16	Dynamic of membrane permeability below and above plasticization pressure	141
Figure 4. 17	Dynamic of membrane permeability above the plasticization pressure at 35°C	143
Figure 4. 18	Dynamic of membrane permeability below the plasticization pressure	146
Figure 4. 19	Measured and modeled CO ₂ sorption isotherms at 25°C	148
Figure 5. 1	Membrane performance based on plasticization pressure and Permeability parameters at plasticization (details of polymers and references are shown in Appendix B)	154
Figure 5. 2	Membrane performance based on the plasticization pressure and productivity loss (details of polymers and references are presented in Appendix B)	155
Figure 5.3	Membrane performance based on the ideal selectivity of CO ₂ /CH ₄ and permeability of CO ₂ at plasticization pressure (Modified Upper Bound Curve for High Pressure CO ₂ Separation)	159
Figure 5. 4	Performance of membrane materials based on scaled plasticization pressure	162

Figure 5. 5	Performance of membrane materials based on scaled CO ₂ permeability	163
Figure 5. 6	Performance of membrane materials based on scaled selectivity	164
Figure 5. 7	Performance of membrane materials based on scaled productivity loss	165
Figure 5. 8	Selection of membrane materials based on overall performance index	166
Figure 5. 9	Plot of a_1' versus T_g for a group of glassy polymers	171
Figure 5.10	Plot of a_2' versus $\frac{1}{FFV}$ for a group of glassy polymers	171
Figure 5. 11	Comparison of the experimental values of plasticization pressure with the values obtained using the SVM for the training outputs	173
Figure 5. 12	Effect of Pressure on Product Recovery	176
Figure 5. 13	Effect of Pressure on Product purity	177
Figure 5. 14	Effect of Pressure on Membrane Area	179
Figure 5. 15	Effect of Pressure on methane loss	180
Figure 5. 16	Effect of Pressure on Gas Processing Cost	182

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A_m	membrane area (m ²)
C	gas concentration
C_1	cost of membrane element
C_2	cost of permeator module
C_3	cost of labour
C_4	cost of hydrocarbon loss
C_h	gas concentration at the upstream
CH_{4f}	concentration of CH ₄ in the feed streams
CH_{4s}	concentration of CH ₄ in the sweet streams
C_l	gas concentration at the downstream
C_{mob}	gas concentration with finite mobility
D	diffusion coefficient
D_0	diffusion coefficient at zero concentration in the polymer matrix
D_D	diffusion coefficient in the Henry site (cm ² /s)
D_H	diffusion coefficient in the Langmuir site (cm ² /s)
E_D	activation energies of diffusion
E_{di}	dispersive cohesive energy
F	fraction of Langmuir sorption species having a finite mobility
F_{di}	dispersive molar attractive constant

F_{pi}	polar molar attractive constant
H_s	heats of solution
p	pressure (bar)
P_A	permeability of fast gas (CO ₂) (kmol.m/m ² .s.bar)
p_h	feed/upstream gas pressure (bar)
p_l	downstream/permeate gas pressure (bar)
P_{pl}	plasticization pressure (bar)
Q	quantity of gas
q_f	feed flow rate in kmol/s
q_p	permeate flow rate in kmol/s
q_r	retentate flow rate in kmol/s
ℓ	membrane thickness (m)
t	time (sec)
T_g	Glass Transition Temperature
t_m	Membrane life (years)
V	molar volume
X_i	numerical value of the property
X_{\max}	maximum value in the list of the property
X_{\min}	minimum value in the list of the property.
x_o	concentration of CO ₂ in the retentate (product) (mol%)

Y_i	scaled membrane properties
y_p	concentration of CO ₂ in the permeate (mol%)

Greek Symbols

θ	stage - cut
β	empirical parameter representing the extent of the concentration dependence of the diffusion
ϕ	constant value or varies with feed pressure
α_i	Weighting (scaling) factor
α	selectivity
$\alpha_{A/B}$	selectivity of A in preference to B
γ	performance index
\$	US Dollar
δ_d^2	dispersive solubility parameter
δ_p^2	polar solubility parameter
δ_h^2	hydrogen solubility parameter
δ_t	total solubility parameter

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

6FDA	2,2'-bis(3,4-dicarboxyphenyl) hexafluoropropane dianhydride
ANN	Artificial Neural Network ,
APTMS	bis (3-aminopropyl)-tetramethyldisiloxane)
BAS	Bis (aminopropyl) polydimethylsiloxane
BCM	Billion Cubic Meters
CD	Cyclodextrin
CH ₄	Methane
CMS	Carbon Molecular Sieve
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
<i>cpm</i>	cost per unit mass (US\$/kg)
CRC	Capital Recovery Cost (\$)
HLC	Cost of Hydrocarbon Loss (US\$/MMBTU)
DADE	Diamino diphenyl ether
DCM	Dichloromethane
DDBT	3,7-diaminodibenzothiophene-5,5'-dioxide
DEG	Diethylene Glycol Dimethylether

DMAc	N,N-Dimethylacetamide
DMF	N,N-Dimethylformamide
DMSO	Dimethyl Sulfoxide
<i>dop</i>	Density of polymer (kg/m ³)
EC	Cost of Energy (kW ⁻¹ hr ⁻¹)
EtOH	Ethanol (EtOH)
EVA	ethylene vinyl acetate
<i>FFV</i>	Fractional Free Volume
GLY	Glycerol (GLY)
GPU	Gas Permeation Unit
HAB	3,3'-dihydroxy-4,4'-diamino-biphenyl
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LC	Cost of Labour (US\$/hr)
LMWC	Low Molecular Weight Compounds
MC	Maintenance Cost (US\$)
OE	Operating Expenses (US\$)
MEC	Cost of Membrane Element (US\$/m ²)

MeOH	Methanol
MGS	Membrane gas separation
MMC	Membrane module manufacturing cost (US\$/m ²)
MMSCFD	Million Standard Cubic Feet
MRC	Membrane Replacement Cost (US\$/m ²)
NG	Natural gas
nm	nanometer
NMP	1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone
PALS	Positron Annihilation Lifetime Spectroscopy
PBI	Poly (benzimidazole)
PBO	Polybenzoxazoles
PBT	Polybenzothiazoles (PBT)
PDMC	propane – diol monoesterified cross – linkable polyimide
PDMS	Poly (dimethyl siloxane)
PEG	Polyethylene glycol
PEO	Polyethylene oxide
PHA	Polyhydroxyamide

PI	Polyimide
PPO	Poly (2, 6-dimethyl-1,4-phenylene oxide)
PSF	Polysulfone
PTFE	Polytetrafluoroethylene
PTMS	Poly[1-(trimethylsilyl)-1-propyne]
S-PEEK	Poly (ether ether ketone)
STP	Standard Temperature and Pressure
SVM	Support Vector Machine
SVR	Support Vector Regression
TCDA	2,3,5-tricarboxy cyclopentyl acetic dianhydride
<i>TCI</i>	Total Capital Investment
TGA	Thermo Gravimetric Analysis
THF	Tetrahydrofuran
TOC	Total Operating Cost (US\$)
TW	Tera watt
XRD	X-ray diffraction

**PEMISAHAN CO₂ PADA BERTEKANAN TINGGI MENGGUNAKAN MEMBRAN:
PEMILIHAN MEMBRAN DAN PEMODELAN PROSES**

ABSTRAK

Pemisahan CO₂ daripada gas asli (NG) telah menarik minat penyelidikan kerana permintaan tenaga yang semakin meningkat dan keperluan teknik penulenan gas yang lebih cekap dan mesra alam. Kebanyakan NG dihasilkan bersama CO₂ yang perlu disingkirkan demi untuk meningkatkan nilai kalorinya. Teknologi membran merupakan salah satu teknologi yang digunakan secara meluas untuk penyingkiran CO₂. Walau bagaimanapun, pasarannya masih kecil berbanding proses-proses pemisahan gas yang lain. Ini adalah kerana penggunaan bahan-bahan membran dengan prestasi pemisahan yang rendah dan keadaan pengoperasian modul yang tidak optimum. Pengoptimuman bersistematik bagi setiap peringkat penyediaan membran dan operasi modul bertekanan tinggi telah dicadangkan untuk menyelesaikan masalah tersebut. Salah satu cabaran utama operasi bertekanan tinggi adalah fenomena kesan penusukan pemplastikan yang disebabkan oleh peningkatan tekanan suapan.

Polimer komersil polisulfona telah diubahsuai untuk mengoptimumkan prestasi pemisahannya. Kajian bertekanan tinggi dan pemodelan matematik telah dijalankan untuk menilai prestasi pemisahan membran. Bagi mewujudkan tekanan suapan yang tertinggi semasa penyingkiran CO₂ tanpa pemplastikan, ciri-ciri pemisahan membran telah dikaji menggunakan ujian penelapan pada tekanan mencecah 57 bar. Kajian dinamik bagi prestasi membran juga dilakukan menggunakan ujikaji penelapan bagi tempoh masa antara 5 hingga 1080 jam (45 hari) dengan pelbagai tekanan antara 6 hingga 57 bar. Model matematik telah

dibangunkan berdasarkan teori “dual-sorption” dan model keseluruhan tidak bergerak. Proses pengoptimuman untuk pemilihan membran telah dicapai dengan menggunakan kaedah pengoptimuman pelbagai objektif, manakala keadaan operasi modul dicapai menggunakan model pengaturcaraan pengoptimuman kekangan non-linear dan algoritma “Golden search” yang dilaksanakan menggunakan MATLAB.

Tekanan pemplastikan bagi membran yang disediakan adalah 41.07 bar manakala kebolehtelapan dan kememilihan pada tekanan ini adalah masing-masing 5.99 Barrer, dan 44.19. Ini merupakan peningkatan sebanyak 17.65% bagi tekanan pemplastikan dan 66.39% bagi kebolehtelapan. Walau bagaimanapun, membran tersebut kehilangan kira-kira 79.65% kebolehtelapannya pada tekanan ini manakala kememilihannya meningkat sebanyak 91.13% jika dibanding dengan nilai pada 5 bar. Ujian kebolehtelapan yang bergantung kepada masa mendedahkan bahawa tekanan pemplastikan sebagai titik keseimbangan boleh digunakan sebagai kekangan dalam pengoptimuman proses pemisahan gas membran. Model matematik yang dibangunkan menunjukkan keupayaan ramalan yang sangat baik untuk tekanan pemplastikan. Pemilihan bahan membran juga didapati mampu dioptimumkan dengan cekap dengan menggunakan kaedah pengoptimuman multi-objektif.